Tachyon warm inflation: measuring the effects of Quantum Cosmology in the light of Planck 2015

Vahid Kamali,[1,*] Spyros Basilakos,[2,†] Ahmad Mehrabi,[1,‡] Meysam Motaharfar,[3,§] and Erfan Massaeli[3,¶]

[1] *Department of Physics, Bu-Ali Sina University, Hamedan 65178, 016016, Iran*
[2] *Academy of Athens, Research Center for Astronomy & Applied Mathematics, Soranou Efessiou 4, 11-527, Athens, Greece*
[3] *Department of Physics, Shahid Beheshti University, G. C., Evin,Tehran 19839, Iran*

(Dated: March 7, 2017)

Abstract: We investigate the observational signatures of quantum cosmology in the Cosmic Microwave Background data provided by Planck collaboration. We apply the warm inflationary paradigm with a tachyon scalar field to the loop quantum cosmology. In this context, we first provide the basic cosmological functions in terms of the tachyon field. We then obtain the slow-roll parameters and the power spectrum of scalar and tensor fluctuations respectively. Finally, we study the performance of various warm inflationary scenarios against the latest Planck data and we find a family of models which are in agreement with the observations.

arXiv:1703.01409v1 [gr-qc] 4 Mar 2017

I. INTRODUCTION

Recent studies of photons in the Cosmic Microwave Background (hereafter CMB) radiation have placed tight constraints on single scalar-field models of slow-roll inflation. Specifically, based on Planck data [1] it has been found that the inflationary models which are in agreement with the data are those with very low tensor-to-scalar fluctuation ratio $r = n_T/n_s \ll 1$, with a scalar spectral index $n_s \simeq 0.96$ and no appreciable running. Actually, the upper bound found by Planck team [1], on this ratio, as a result of the non-observation of B-modes, is $r < 0.11$ which implies that $H \lesssim 10^{-5} M_p$, where $M_p \simeq 1.22 \times 10^{19}$Gev is the Planck mass.

In the standard picture of slow-roll inflation [2, 3] the kinetic energy $(\dot{\phi}^2/2)$ and the potential energy $V(\phi)$ of the inflaton field satisfies $\dot{\phi}^2/2 \ll V(\phi)$. The latter condition imposes the deSitter expansion in the early universe, since the corresponding equation of state parameter $w \equiv \frac{(\dot{\phi}^2/2)-V(\phi)}{(\dot{\phi}^2/2)+V(\phi)}$ tends to -1. Moreover, in the standard inflation possible interactions among other fields with the inflaton must be neglected. Subsequently, after the slow-roll era the potential energy becomes comparable to the kinetic energy. This simply means that we are dealing with the so called reheating period in which the inflaton starts to oscillate around the minimum of the potential and progressively the universe is filled by radiation [4, 5].

In the literature one may find other theoretical approaches in order to treat the nature of the early universe. Specifically, over the last two decades a lot of attention has been paid on the so-called warm inflationary pattern. Unlike to standard inflation, in this scenario the inflaton field is allowed to interact with other light fields, implying that radiation production occurs during the slow-roll period and hence reheating is avoided [6, 7]. Obviously, the main idea of the warm inflationary model is quite different with that of the standard cold inflation. Indeed, warm inflation satisfies the condition $T > H$, where T is the temperature and H is the Hubble parameter, which implies that the fluctuations of the inflaton field are thermal instead of quantum. These thermal fluctuations play an eminent role in large scale structure studies because they are the initial seeds of density perturbations [8–10].

From the scalar-field viewpoint, warm inflation is characterized by a tachyon scalar field with positive potential $V(\phi)$, while the corresponding kinetic energy does not obey the standard form (k-inflation [11]). Also the potential energy has two special properties, namely a maximum at $\phi \to 0$ and a minimum when $\phi \to \infty$. For more details regarding the warm tachyon inflationary model we refer the reader to Refs.[12–14]. In this framework, it is well known that under specific conditions tachyon fields which are related with unstable D-branes [15] provide cosmic acceleration [11, 16, 17] during early times.

In the current article we present the dynamical behavior of the effective Loop Quantum Gravity (LQG) theory via the Hubble expansion, and investigate the compatibility of this scenario with warm tachyon-like inflationary scenarios. The basic techniques of LQG [18–21], can be applied in homogeneous and isotropic space-times in order to build a Loop Quantum Cosmology (LQC). The layout of the paper is as follows: At the beginning of Sec. II we present the main points of the LQC and then we discuss the scalar field description of the warm tachyon inflationary paradigm in the context of LQC. In Sec. III we estimate the slow roll parameters and in Sec, IV we calculate the temperature at the end of warm inflation. In Sec V we test the performance of the slow-roll predictions against the latest *Planck 2015* data and finally, we summarize our conclusions in Sec. VI.

* vkamali@basu.ac.ir
† svasil@academyofathens.gr
‡ Mehrabi@basu.ac.ir
§ mmotaharfar2000@gmail.com
¶ erfan.massaeli@gmail.com

II. LOOP QUANTUM COSMOLOGY VERSUS WARM INFLATION

In this section we briefly present the basic cosmological features of Loop Quantum Cosmology (LQC). In the literature canonical quantization of gravity is given in terms of the so called Ashtekar-Barbero connection variables (see [22]). Without wanting to enter into the full details the phase space of classical general relativity can be spanned by conjugate variables A^i_j (connection) and E^j_i (triad) on a $3-manifold\,\mathcal{M}$ which encodes curvature and spatial geometry respectively (labels j and i denote internal indices of $SU(2)$ and space index respectively). At the cosmological level (LQC) due to the isotropic and homogeneous symmetries the phase space is characterized by a single connection c and a single triad p. Notice, that the Poisson bracket of LQC variables is given by

$$\{c, p\} = \frac{8\pi\gamma}{3M_p^2}$$

where $\gamma \simeq 0.2375$ is the dimensionless Barbero-Immirzi parameter. derived from the black hole thermodynamics.

Considering a spatially flat Friedmann-Robertson-Walker (FRW) metric, the LQC variables become

$$c = \gamma\dot{a} \qquad p = a^2,$$

where $a(t)$ is the scale factor of the universe and the overdot denotes derivative with respect to cosmic time t. In the variable system $\{c, p\}$ Ashtekar et al. [22] proposed that the classical Hamiltonian constraint is given by

$$\mathcal{H}_{cl} = -\frac{3\sqrt{p}}{\gamma^2} + c^2 + \mathcal{H}_m$$

where $\mathcal{H}_m$ is the matter Hamiltonian. However, in the semi-classical regime various authors [21, 23, 24] introduced an effective theory of loop quantum gravity which is appropriate for cosmology. In this case the effective Hamiltonian constraint is written as

$$\mathcal{H}_{\rm eff} = -\frac{3\sqrt{p}}{\gamma\overline{\mu}^2}\sin^2(\mu c) + \mathcal{H}_m$$

where the constant $\overline{\mu}$ is related to the minimal area of LQG (for more details see [21, 23, 24]). Now, using the effective Hamilton equation

$$\dot{p} = \{p, \mathcal{H}_{\rm eff}\} = -\frac{\gamma}{3}\frac{\partial\mathcal{H}_{\rm eff}}{\partial c}$$

and the Hamiltonian constraint ($\mathcal{H}_{\rm eff} \approx 0$) [21] we can obtain the following equations of motion:

$$\dot{a} = \frac{1}{\gamma\overline{\mu}}\sin(\overline{\mu}c)\cos(\overline{\mu}c)$$
$$\sin^2(\overline{\mu}c) = \frac{8\pi}{3M_p^2 a}\mathcal{H}_m.$$

Lastly, combining the above set of equations we provide the first Friedmann equation, namely the Hubble parameter

$$H^2 = \frac{\kappa}{3}\rho\left(1 - \frac{\rho}{\rho_c}\right), \tag{1}$$

where $\kappa = 8\pi G = 8\pi M_p^{-2}$, ρ is the total energy density and $\rho_c = \sqrt{3}/(16\pi^2 G^2\gamma^3)$ appears as the critical loop quantum density.

Below, following the work of [25, 26] we introduce the analysis of the tachyon field in the framework of LQC. Specifically, up to this point we did not specify the nature of the fluids involved. Let us now consider that we have a mixture of two fluids, radiation and tachyon field. Therefore, the total density takes the form $\rho = \rho_\phi + \rho_\gamma$, where ρ_ϕ and ρ_γ are the corresponding tachyon field and radiation densities. In this framework the overall action [27] is written as

$$S = \int d^4x\sqrt{-g}\,(L_\phi + L_\gamma)$$

where g is determinant of the metric and R is the Ricci scalar. Notice that the Lagrangian of the tachyon field [27] which is non-minimally coupled to gravity is given by

$$L_\phi = \frac{R}{2\kappa} - V(\phi)\sqrt{1 - g^{\mu\nu}\partial_\mu\phi\partial_\nu\phi} \tag{2}$$

and the radiation Lagrangian L_γ is associated with a fluid of photons with pressure $P_\gamma = \frac{\rho_\gamma}{3}$.

Therefore, using the conservation law for the total energy density we find

$$\dot{\rho}_\phi + 3H(\rho_\phi + p_\phi) + \dot{\rho}_\gamma + 4H\rho_\gamma = 0\,. \tag{3}$$

This law is the outcome of imposing the covariant conservation of the total energy density of the combined system of tachyon field and radiation, and thus is a direct reflection of the Bianchi identity satisfied by the geometric side of the Einsteins equation. Due to the fact that in warm inflationary scenario [12, 13, 28–31], the tachyon-field/photon interaction leads to radiation production one can split Eq.(3) as follows

$$\dot{\rho_\phi} + 3\,H\,(\rho_\phi + p_\phi) = -\Gamma\dot{\phi}^2, \tag{4}$$

$$\dot{\rho}_\gamma + 4H\rho_\gamma = \Gamma\dot{\phi}^2, \tag{5}$$

where the positive quantity Γ is the dissipation factor in unit of M_{pl}^5. Usually, in this kind of studies the dissipation term $\Gamma\dot{\phi}^2$ is given on a phenomenological basis in order to describe the nearly-thermal radiation bath of the warm inflationary paradigm. Notice, that in several papers [12, 13, 30, 32–34] one may find another parameter that characterizes warm inflation, namely the dimensionless dissipation parameter $R \equiv \frac{\Gamma}{3H\rho_\phi}$. Within this framework, equation (4) boils down

$$\dot{\rho}_\phi = -3H\dot{\phi}^2\rho_\phi\,(1 + R)\,. \tag{6}$$

Notice, that if $R \gg 1$ then we are in the high dissipation regime, while in the weak dissipation regime the dimensionless dissipation parameter tends to zero ($\Gamma/3H\rho_\phi \ll 1$).

Utilizing the energy momentum tensor of the tachyon field

$$T^{\mu}_{\nu}(\phi) = \frac{\partial L}{\partial(\partial_\mu \phi)}\partial_\nu \phi - g^{\mu}_{\nu} L_\phi = \mathrm{diag}(-\rho_\phi, p_\phi, p_\phi, p_\phi) \quad (7)$$

equation and the corresponding Lagrangian one can obtain

$$\rho_\phi = \frac{V(\phi)}{\sqrt{1-\dot{\phi}^2}}, \quad p_\phi = -V(\phi)\sqrt{1-\dot{\phi}^2}\,. \quad (8)$$

Inserting the above equations into Eq.(4) we immediately derive the modified Klein-Gordon equation which provides the time-evolution of ϕ

$$\frac{\ddot{\phi}}{1-\dot{\phi}^2} + 3H\dot{\phi} + \frac{1}{V}\frac{dV}{d\phi} = -\frac{\Gamma}{V}\dot{\phi}\sqrt{1-\dot{\phi}^2}. \quad (9)$$

As it is obvious from the above equation the energy exchange between the tachyon field and radiation introduces an additional friction term that modifies the standard Klein-Gordon equation.

At the epoch of warm inflation it is safe to assume that the energy density of the tachyon field is the dominant component of the cosmic fluid ($\rho_\phi \gg \rho_\gamma$ see [35]). Therefore, the effective Friedmann Eq. (1) reduces to

$$H^2 = \frac{\kappa}{3}\rho_\phi\left(1 - \frac{\rho_\phi}{\rho_c}\right). \quad (10)$$

On the other hand, utilizing Eqs. (6, 10), one can easily show that

$$\dot{\phi}^2 = -\frac{2\dot{H}}{\kappa\rho_\phi(1+R)}\left(1 - \frac{12H^2}{\kappa\rho_c}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (11)$$

Moreover, if we consider that the quantity $\Gamma\dot{\phi}^2$ varies adiabatically then the radiation component evolves slowly which means that $\dot{\rho}_\gamma \ll 4H\rho_\gamma$ and $\dot{\rho}_\gamma \ll \Gamma\dot{\phi}^2$. Under the latter conditions the combination of Eq. (5) and Eq. (11) yields

$$\rho_\gamma = \frac{\Gamma\dot{\phi}^2}{4H} = \frac{-\Gamma\dot{H}}{2\kappa H(1+R)\rho_\phi}\left(1 - \frac{12H^2}{\kappa\rho_c}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (12)$$

On the other hand, under adiabatic condition the above formula can be identified with the expression relating ρ_γ with the radiation temperature T. By adding all the degrees of freedom of the created massless modes, the relationship between the radiation energy density and the temperature is given by [36],

$$\rho_\gamma = C_\gamma T^4 \quad (13)$$

and combining with Eq.(12) we find

$$T = \left[\frac{-\Gamma\dot{H}}{2\kappa C_\gamma H(1+R)\rho_\phi}\right]^{\frac{1}{4}}\left(1 - \frac{12H^2}{\kappa\rho_c}\right)^{-\frac{1}{8}}, \quad (14)$$

where $C_\gamma = \pi^2 g_*/30$ in which we included the degrees of freedom of the created massless modes via the g_* factor. Substituting Eq. (14) in (18) we obtain

$$\Gamma^{1-\frac{m}{4}}(1+R)^{\frac{m}{4}} = C_\phi \phi^{1-m}\left(\frac{-\dot{H}}{2\kappa C_\gamma H\rho_\phi}\right)^{\frac{m}{4}}\left(1 - \frac{12H^2}{\kappa\rho_c}\right)^{-\frac{m}{8}}. \quad (15)$$

Now, by solving Eq.(10) for the tachyon density and using simultaneously Eq.(11) we find:

$$V(\phi) = \frac{\rho_c}{2}\left(1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{12H^2}{\kappa\rho_c}}\right) \times \left[1 + \frac{2\dot{H}}{\kappa\rho_\phi(1+R)}\left(1 - \frac{12H^2}{\kappa\rho_c}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (16)$$

Lastly, including the slow-roll approximation $\dot{\phi}^2 \ll 1$ in Eq.(8) we have $\rho_\phi \simeq V(\phi)$ and thus $R = \frac{\Gamma}{3HV}$. Therefore, Eq. (16) reduces to

$$V(\phi) \simeq \frac{\rho_c}{2}\left(1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{12H^2}{\kappa\rho_c}}\right). \quad (17)$$

As expected, the potential energy is given in terms of the arbitrary initial scale of the loop quantum density ρ_c.

From the above analysis it becomes clear that the aforementioned cosmological functions strongly dependent on the dissipation factor Γ and the background expansion history, through the Hubble parameter $H(t)$. As we have already mentioned the tachyon field is exchanging energy with radiation implying that the dissipation factor is a characteristic quantity of warm inflation. Although, the precise form of the dissipation factor has yet to be found, various candidates for Γ have been proposed in the literature. In the present study, based on the notations [37, 38] we treat the dissipation factor as follows

$$\Gamma(\phi, T) = C_\phi \frac{T^m}{\phi^{m-1}}, \quad (18)$$

where T is the temperature, C_ϕ is constant. From now on, we will call Γ_m the parametrization of the dissipation factor where the index m determines the form of Γ. Under the latter parametrization we immediately recognize the following situations: (a) when $m = -1$ (hereafter Γ_{-1}) we have $\Gamma = C_\phi \frac{\phi^2}{T}$ which corresponds to the dissipation rate of the non-SUSY model [39–41], (b) for $m = 0$ (Γ_0 parametrization) we get $\Gamma = C_\phi\phi$ (SUSY case see [39]) (c) for $m = 1$ (Γ_1 parametrization) we have $\Gamma = C_\phi T$ (see Refs.[42–45]) and (d) for $m = 3$ (Γ_3

parametrization) we obtain $\Gamma = C_\phi \frac{T^3}{\phi^2}$ that corresponds to the low temperature SUSY model [46–49].

Regarding the functional form of the Hubble parameter $H(t)$ we utilize Barrow's [50] solution for the scale factor of the universe. In particular, in the context of warm intermediate inflation the scale factor obeys the following exponential expression:

$$a(t) = a_I \exp(At^f)\,, \tag{19}$$

where f lies in the interval $0 < f < 1$. Obviously, the evolution of Hubble parameter and its first time-derivative are given by

$$H = \frac{\dot{a}}{a} = Aft^{f-1}, \quad \dot{H} = Af\,(f-1)\,t^{f-2}. \tag{20}$$

In this scenario the cosmic expansion evolves slower than the standard deSitter model, $a(t) \propto \exp(H_I t)$ [$H(t) = H_I$ =const.] and faster than the power-law inflation ($a \propto t^p$, $p > 1$).

III. THE STRONG DISSIPATIVE REGIME AND SLOW-ROLL PARAMETERS

In the rest of the paper we focus our analysis on the high dissipation regime ($R \gg 1$). Hence, Eqs. (11, 15) reduces to

$$\dot{\phi}^2 = -\frac{6H\dot{H}}{\kappa\Gamma}\left(1 - \frac{12H^2}{\kappa\rho_c}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{21}$$

$$\Gamma = C_\phi \phi^{1-m}\left(-\frac{3}{2}\frac{\dot{H}}{C_\gamma \kappa}\right)^{\frac{m}{4}}\left(1 - \frac{12H^2}{\kappa\rho_c}\right)^{-\frac{m}{8}}. \tag{22}$$

If we insert Eq. (22) in Eq. (21) then the evolution of tachyon scalar field is given by

$$\dot{\phi} = \left[\frac{4C_\gamma}{C_\phi} H\phi^{m-1}\left(-\frac{3\dot{H}}{2\kappa C_\gamma}\right)^{\frac{4-m}{4}}\left(1 - \frac{12H^2}{\kappa\rho_c}\right)^{\frac{m-4}{8}}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{23}$$

Performing the integration of Eq. (23) with the aid of Eq. (20) we have

$$\phi(t) - \phi(0) = \begin{cases} \left[\frac{(3-m)G_m(t)}{2K_m}\right]^{2/(3-m)} & \text{for } m \neq 3 \\ \exp\left[\frac{G_m(t)}{K_m}\right] & \text{for } m = 3 \end{cases} \tag{24}$$

where K_m and $G_m(t)$ are defined as follows

$$K_m \equiv \frac{(8-m)f + 2m - 4}{8}\left(\frac{4AfC_\gamma}{C_\phi}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \times \left(\frac{3Af(1-f)}{2\kappa C_\gamma}\right)^{\frac{m-4}{8}}. \tag{25}$$

$$G_m(t) \equiv t^{\frac{(8-m)f+2m-4}{8}}\,{}_1F_2\left[\frac{4-m}{16}, \frac{(8-m)f+2m-4}{16(f-1)}, 1 + \frac{(8-m)f+2m-4}{16(f-1)}, St^{2f-2}\right]. \tag{26}$$

Notice, that ${}_1F_2$ is the hypergeometric function and $S \equiv \frac{12A^2f^2}{\kappa\rho_c}$. Without any loss of generality we impose $\phi(0) = 0$.

Under the above conditions the Hubble parameter can be expressed as a function of the tachyon scalar field as follows

$$H(\varphi) = Af\left(G_m^{-1}\left(K_m\varphi\right)\right)^{f-1}, \tag{27}$$

in which G_m^{-1} corresponds to the inverse function of $G_m(t)$. Moreover, the variable φ is given by

$$\varphi = \begin{cases} \frac{2\phi^{(3-m)/2}}{3-m} & \text{for } m \neq 3 \\ \ln(\phi) & \text{for } m = 3. \end{cases} \tag{28}$$

Therefore, using Eqs.(17, 20, 22, 26),the potential and the dissipation factor are calculated as:

$$V(\varphi) \simeq \frac{\rho_c}{2}\left[1 - \left(1 - S\left(G_m^{-1}(K_m\varphi)\right)^{2f-2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right], \tag{29}$$

and

$$\Gamma(\varphi) = C_\phi \varphi^{1-m}\left(\frac{3Af(1-f)\left(G_m^{-1}(K_m\varphi)\right)^{f-2}}{2\kappa C_\gamma}\right)^{\frac{m}{4}} \times \left(1 - S\left(G_m^{-1}(K_m\varphi)\right)^{2f-2}\right)^{-\frac{m}{8}}. \tag{30}$$

Now, using standard lines we are ready to provide the slow-roll parameters

$$\epsilon \equiv -\frac{\dot{H}}{H^2}, \quad \eta \equiv -\frac{\ddot{H}}{2H\dot{H}}. \tag{31}$$

Indeed, with the aid of Eqs. (20,22, 26) the slow-roll parameters become

$$\epsilon = \frac{1-f}{Aft^f} = \frac{1-f}{Af\left(G_m^{-1}(K_m\varphi)\right)^f}, \tag{32}$$

$$\eta = \frac{2-f}{2Aft^f} = \frac{2-f}{2Af\left(G_m^{-1}(K_m\varphi)\right)^f}. \tag{33}$$

$$\tag{34}$$

We would like to stress here that for the intermediate inflation the slow-roll parameters are always less than unity which means that inflation never ends. In our model the condition $\epsilon = 1$ makes sure that inflation starts at the earliest possible stage [51, 52]. As far as the number of e-folds is concerned we have

$$N = \int_{t_{in}}^{t_k} H dt = A\left(t_k^f - t_{in}^f\right) \tag{35}$$

or

$$N = A\left(\left(G_m^{-1}(K_m\varphi_k)\right)^f - \left(G_m^{-1}(K_m\varphi_{in})\right)^f\right), \quad (36)$$

where for the last equality we used Eq.(20). Also, $\varphi_k = \varphi(t_k)$ and $\varphi_{in} = \varphi(t_{in})$ denote the values at the horizon crossing and at the beginning of inflation respectively. Equating Eqs. (32) to unity, $\epsilon(\varphi_{in}) = 1$ and using Eqs.(24) and (28) the value of the tachyon scalar field at the beginning of inflation is given by

$$\phi_{in} = \begin{cases} [\frac{(3-m)G_m(y)}{2K_m}]^{2/(3-m)} & \text{for } m \neq 3 \\ \exp\left[\frac{G_m(y)}{K_m}\right] & \text{for } m = 3 \end{cases}, \quad (37)$$

where $y = \left(\frac{1-f}{Af}\right)^{1/f}$. To this end, it becomes clear that from (37) one may express Eqs. (27 - 34) as a function of N. Indeed, by doing that we find

$$\phi_k = \begin{cases} \left[\frac{(3-m)G_m(I(N))}{2K_m}\right]^{2/(3-m)} & \text{for } m \neq 3 \\ \exp\left[\frac{G_m(I(N))}{K_m}\right] & \text{for } m = 3 \end{cases} \quad (38)$$

where $I(N) = (\frac{1+f(N-1)}{fA})^{\frac{1}{f}}$. One of the most important features of any inflationary scenario is related with the formation of large scale structures. For example, in the case of warm inflationary paradigm thermal fluctuations play a key role because they provide the initial seeds for the formation of cosmic structures. The situation regarding cosmological perturbations within the effective Hamiltonian formalism in LQC has been studied in [53–56], which however is beyond the scope of the present study. Following Refs.[6, 57] the corresponding power spectrum of scalar fluctuations for LQC is presented by

$$\mathcal{P}_\mathcal{R} = \frac{H^2}{\dot\phi^2}\delta\phi^2. \quad (39)$$

As we have already defined in the introduction the nature of scalar perturbations in warm inflation is thermal and not quantum as we consider in the standard inflationary model. In particular, it has been found [6–8] that in the case of $R \gg 1$ warm scalar perturbations obey the following expression

$$\delta\phi^2 \simeq \frac{k_F T}{2M_{pl}^4\pi^2}, \quad (40)$$

where the wave number $k_F = \sqrt{\frac{\Gamma H}{V}} = H\sqrt{\frac{\Gamma}{3HV}} \geq H$ provides the freeze-out scale at which the dissipation damps out to thermally excited fluctuations of inflaton ($\frac{V''}{V'} < \frac{\Gamma H}{V}$) [58]. Inserting the wave-number k_F and Eq.(40) into Eq.(39) we arrive at

$$\mathcal{P}_\mathcal{R} = \frac{\kappa^2 H^{\frac{5}{2}}\Gamma^{\frac{1}{2}}T}{128\pi^4 V^{\frac{1}{2}}\dot\phi^2}. \quad (41)$$

We continue our calculations by substituting Eqs. (27 - 34) and Eqs. (37) in Eq. (41) we obtain the power spectrum in terms of the number of e-folds

$$\mathcal{P}_\mathcal{R} = P_m\left(I(N)\right)^{\frac{3m+6}{8}f-\frac{3m}{4}}\left(1-S\left(I(N)\right)^{2f-2}\right)^{\frac{6-3m}{16}} \times\left(1-\left(1-S\left(I(N)\right)^{2f-2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\left(\frac{G_m(I(N))}{K_m}\right)^{\frac{3(1-m)}{2}}, \quad (42)$$

where

$$P_m = \left(\frac{\kappa^2(Af)^{\frac{3}{2}}C_\phi^{\frac{3}{2}}}{256\sqrt{2}\pi^4\sqrt{\rho_c}C_\gamma}\right)\left(\frac{3Af(1-f)}{2\kappa C_\gamma}\right)^{\frac{3m-6}{8}}. \quad (43)$$

At this point we introduce the spectral spectral index in our analysis which is defined as

$$n_s - 1 \equiv \frac{d\ln\mathcal{P}_\mathcal{R}}{d\ln k}. \quad (44)$$

Since $d\ln k = -dN$ and after some simple algebra the scalar spectral index takes the form

$$n_s - 1 = n_1 + n_2 + n_3 + n_4, \quad (45)$$

with

$$n_1 = -\frac{\frac{3m+6}{8}f-\frac{3}{4}}{Af\left(I(N)\right)^f}, \quad (46)$$

$$n_2 = -\frac{(6-3m)S(f-1)\left(I(N)\right)^{f-2}}{8Af\left(1-S\left(I(N)\right)^{2f-2}\right)}, \quad (47)$$

$$n_3 = \frac{(f-1)S\left(I(N)\right)^{f-2}\left(1-S\left(I(N)\right)^{2f-2}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}}{2Af\left(1-\left(1-S\left(I(N)\right)^{2f-2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)}, \quad (48)$$

$$n_4 = -\frac{3(1-m)\left((8-m)f+2m-4\right)}{8K_m}\left(I(N)\right)^{-\frac{m}{8}(f-2)-\frac{1}{2}} \times\left(1-S\left(I(N)\right)^{2f-2}\right)^{\frac{m-4}{16}}\left(2Af\left(\frac{G_m(I(N))}{K_m}\right)^{\frac{3-m}{2}}\right)^{-1}. \quad (49)$$

On the other hand, the amplitude of tensor fluctuations is given by

$$\mathcal{P}_t = 8\kappa\left(\frac{H}{2\pi}\right)^2, \quad (50)$$

from which we can define the tensor-to-scalar ratio

$$r \equiv \frac{\mathcal{P}_t}{\mathcal{P}_\mathcal{R}} = \frac{256\pi^2 V^{\frac{1}{2}}\dot\phi^2}{\kappa H^{\frac{1}{2}}\Gamma^{\frac{1}{2}}T}. \quad (51)$$

Finally, introducing the appropriate formulas of H, V, Γ and T in the above equation we find

$$r = r_m \left(I(N)\right)^{\frac{10-3m}{8}f+\frac{6m-16}{8}} \left(1 - S\left(I(N)\right)^{2f-2}\right)^{\frac{3m-6}{16}} \times \left(1 - \left(1 - S\left(I(N)\right)^{2f-2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{G_m(I(N))}{K_m}\right)^{\frac{3(1-m)}{2}} \tag{52}$$

where

$$r_m = \frac{256\pi^2 C_\gamma}{\kappa C_\phi^{\frac{3}{2}}} \sqrt{2\rho_c A f} \left(\frac{3Af(1-f)}{2\kappa C_\gamma}\right)^{\frac{6-3m}{8}}. \tag{53}$$

IV. TEMPERATURE AT THE END OF INFLATION

In this section, following the methodology of [59] we attempt to derive the temperature at the end of warm inflationary scenario. The entire cosmological history contains the following eras: I) from t_k (Hubble crossing time) till the end of slow-roll warm inflation which is denoted by t_{end}, II) from t_{end} (recombination era) till the recombination epoch which is indicated by t_{rec} and III) from t_{rec} up to present time t_0, for which we have the matter and dark energy dominated eras. Therefore, it is easy to write

$$e^{N_{tot}} = \frac{a_0}{a_k} = \frac{1}{a_k} = \frac{H_k}{k} = \frac{a_0}{a_{rec}}\frac{a_{rec}}{a_{end}}\frac{a_{end}}{a_k} = e^{N_0} e^{N_{rec}} e^{N} \tag{54}$$

and thus $N_{tot} = N_0 + N_{rec} + N$. Notice that in the above expression $a_0 \equiv 1$ is the scale factor at the present time, $k = a_k H_k$ is the Fourier mode, N_{tot} is the total number of e-folds, $N_{rec} \equiv \frac{a_{rec}}{a_{end}}$, $N_0 \equiv \frac{a_0}{a_{rec}}$ and N is given by Eq.(35).

At the end of warm inflation, the cosmic expansion enters in the radiation dominated era in which the universe is full of relativistic particles. Under adiabatic circumstances the radiation entropy per comoving volume reads

$$S = \frac{2\pi^2}{45} g T^3 a^3 \tag{55}$$

from which we find

$$\frac{a_{rec}}{a_{end}} = \frac{T_{end}}{T_{rec}} \left(\frac{g_{end}}{g_{rec}}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \tag{56}$$

or

$$e^{N_{rec}} = \frac{T_{end}}{T_{rec}} \left(\frac{g_{end}}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}. \tag{57}$$

In the last step we utilized the entropy conservation law of the adiabatic radiation phase, which means that $g_{end} T_{end}^3 a_{end}^3 = g_{rec} T_{rec}^3 a_{rec}^3$ and we have set $g_{rec} = g_\gamma = 2$. On the other hand, the temperature at the recombination epoch satisfies the well known formula

$$T_{rec} = (1 + z_{rec})\, T_{CMB}. \tag{58}$$

Inserting the above in Eq.(57) we find

$$e^{N_0} e^{N_{rec}} = \frac{T_{end}}{T_{CMB}} \left(\frac{g_{end}}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}, \tag{59}$$

where

$$e^{N_0} = \frac{a_0}{a_{rec}} = (1 + z_{rec}). \tag{60}$$

Lastly, using Eqs. (27, 36, 37), the Hubble parameter at the Hubble crossing time is written as a function of N, namely

$$H_k(N) = Af\left(I(N)\right)^{f-1}. \tag{61}$$

Substituting Eq. (59) in Eq. (54) and utilizing Eq. (61) we obtain the temperature at the end of warm inflation

$$T_{end} = T_{CMB} \frac{Af\left(I(N)\right)^{f-1}}{k} \left(\frac{2}{g_{end}}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} e^{-N}. \tag{62}$$

Obviously, in order to compute T_{end} we need to know the parameters A, f and N or equivalently the pair (n_s, r). Of course, we expect that the temperature at the end of warm inflation to satisfy the following inequality $T_{BBN} < T_{end} < T_I$, where $T_{BBN} \sim 10^{-2}$Gev is the temperature at the Big Bang nucleosynthesis (BBN) and T_I is the estimated temperature scale of inflation, an upper bound of which is provided by Planck team [1], $\sim 10^{16}$Gev.

V. OBSERVATIONAL CONSTRAINTS

In order to check the consistency of the above slow-roll predictions with observation, we compare our results against those of *Planck* [1]. Notice, that the pair (n_s, r) is given by Eqs.(45,52). Also, regarding the number of e-folds we use $N = 50$ and $N = 60$ respectively.

In particular we find:

- For the Γ_{-1} ($m = -1$) parametrization: In fig.(1) we present the (n_s, r) contours together with our prediction for various values of f, A and C_ϕ. Specifically, in this graph the solid, dot-dashed and dashed lines correspond to $(A, f, C_\phi) = (3.1, 0.7, 10000)$, $(A, f, C_\phi) = (2.8, 0.63, 5000)$ and $(A, f, C_\phi) = (4, 0.63, 15000)$ respectively. We observe that in the case of large C_ϕ the scalar-to-tensor ratio r (51) becomes small with respect to the reference Planck result, while the spectral index lies in the interval $0.955 < n_s < 0.975$ Therefore, we argue that it is always possible to find the appropriate value of C_ϕ in order to get predictions which are in agreement with those of Planck. For example, using $A = 3.3, f = 0.7, C_\phi = 15000$ we obtain $(n_s, r) = (0.965691, 0.0141694)$.



FIG. 1. 1σ and 2σ contours borrowed from Planck [1]. Our results are given in the case of Γ_{-1} $(m=-1)$ parameterization. Notice, that solid, dotdashed and dashed curves denote $(A=3.1, f=0.7, C_\phi=10000)$, $(A=2.8, f=0.63, C_\phi=5000)$ and $(A=4, f=0.63, C_\phi=15000)$ respectively.



FIG. 2. The same contours as in figure 1. Here our results corresponds to Γ_0 $(m=0)$ parametrization. The dashed, solid and dot-dashed curves denote $(A=3.1, f=0.59, C_\phi=5000)$, $(A=4.6, f=0.59, C_\phi=10000)$ and $(A=4.3, f=0.59, C_\phi=15000)$ respectively.

- For the Γ_0 $(m=0)$ parametrization: here our results can be found in figure (2) for the following special cases: $(A, f, C_\phi)=(4.6, 0.59, 10000)$ [see solid curve], $(A, f, C_\phi)=(3.1, 0.59, 5000)$ [see dashed curve], and $(A, f, C_\phi)=(4.3, 0.59, 15000)$ [see dot-dashed curve]. As in the previous case, also here we need to fine-tune C_ϕ in order to be consistent with observations. As an example, using $A=4.6, f=0.59, C_\phi=15000$ we obtain $(n_s, r)=(0.960205, 0.0191892)$.

- For the Γ_1 $(m=1)$ parametrization: We argue bellow that this model alleviates the fine-tuning issue of the above parametrizations. We remind the reader warm inflation satisfies the following condition $T>H$ (or $\frac{T}{H}>1$). For $m=1$ the ratio between the T and H is given by (14),(20),(35):

$$\frac{T}{H}=\left(\frac{3}{2C_\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}}\left(\frac{1-f}{f^3A^3}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}}(I(N))^{\frac{3f-2}{4}} \tag{63}$$

In Fig.(3) we show $\frac{T}{H}$ in $A-f$ plane. The black solid line corresponds to the boundary limit $\frac{T}{H}=1$, while the top left part of the plane is consistent with the restriction $\frac{T}{H}>1$. Moreover, in Fig.(4) we plot the $A-f$ allowed area in which our (n_s, r) results are in agreement with those of Planck within 1σ errors. Notice, that the transparent background (foreground opaque) corresponds to $N=60$ $(N=50)$. From this figure we observe that for different values of the dissipation coefficient C_ϕ we always find a narrow strip in the $A-f$ parameter space which is in agreement with Planck's priors of n_s and r. Indeed, in Fig.(5) we plot the Planck confidence contours in the plane of (n_s, r). On top of that we show the big solid point for the individual pair of (n_s, r) in the case of $N=60$. Also, we provide the corresponding small solid point for $N=50$. The comparison indicates that the (n_s, r) Planck data favor the warm inflationary LQC scenario within the context of Γ_1 parametrization.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In this work, we studied the observational signatures of quantum cosmology in the Cosmic Microwave Background data given by Planck2015. We utilized the paradigm of warm inflation with a tachyon scalar field to the loop quantum cosmology. Within this framework, we first derived the main cosmological quantities as a function of the tachyon field. Second, we provided the slow-roll parameters and the power spectrum of scalar and tensor fluctuations respectively. Finally, we checked the performance of various warm inflationary models against



FIG. 3. The ratio $\frac{T}{H}$ in the A-f plane. The black solid line indicates the boundary $\frac{T}{H} = 1$ and the left top part of plane corresponds to $\frac{T}{H} > 1$.



FIG. 4. A-f pairs which are consistent within 1σ region of *Planck results. In each panel the C_ϕ is given in top panel and the black solid line is same as Fig.(3).*

the data provided by Planck2015 data and we find a class of patterns which are consistent with the observations.

VII. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

SB acknowledges support by the Research Center for Astronomy of the Academy of Athens in the context of the program "Testing general relativity on cosmological scales" (ref. number 200/872).

[1] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* (Planck), (2015), arXiv:1502.02114 [astro-ph.CO].
[2] A. H. Guth, Phys. Rev. **D23**, 347 (1981).
[3] A. Albrecht and P. J. Steinhardt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 1220 (1982).
[4] Y. Shtanov, J. H. Traschen, and R. H. Brandenberger, Phys. Rev. **D51**, 5438 (1995), arXiv:hep-ph/9407247 [hep-ph].
[5] L. Kofman, A. D. Linde, and A. A. Starobinsky, Phys. Rev. **D56**, 3258 (1997), arXiv:hep-ph/9704452 [hep-ph].
[6] A. Berera, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 3218 (1995), arXiv:astro-ph/9509049 [astro-ph].
[7] A. Berera, Phys. Rev. **D55**, 3346 (1997), arXiv:hep-ph/9612239 [hep-ph].
[8] L. M. H. Hall, I. G. Moss, and A. Berera, Phys. Rev. **D69**, 083525 (2004), arXiv:astro-ph/0305015 [astro-ph].
[9] I. G. Moss, Phys. Lett. **B154**, 120 (1985).
[10] A. Berera, Nucl. Phys. **B585**, 666 (2000), arXiv:hep-ph/9904409 [hep-ph].
[11] C. Armendariz-Picon, T. Damour, and V. F. Mukhanov, Phys. Lett. **B458**, 209 (1999), arXiv:hep-th/9904075 [hep-th].
[12] R. Herrera, S. del Campo, and C. Campuzano, JCAP **0610**, 009 (2006), arXiv:astro-ph/0610339 [astro-ph].
[13] M. R. Setare and V. Kamali, JCAP **1208**, 034 (2012), arXiv:1210.0742 [hep-th].
[14] A. Deshamukhya and S. Panda, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **D18**, 2093 (2009), arXiv:0901.0471 [hep-th].
[15] A. Sen, JHEP **04**, 048 (2002), arXiv:hep-th/0203211 [hep-th].
[16] A. Sen, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A17**, 1797 (2002), arXiv:hep-th/0204143 [hep-th].
[17] M. Sami, P. Chingangbam, and T. Qureshi, Phys. Rev. **D66**, 043530 (2002), arXiv:hep-th/0205179 [hep-th].
[18] T. Thiemann, *271st WE-Heraeus Seminar on Aspects of Quantum Gravity: From Theory to Experiment Search Bad Honnef, Germany, February 25-March 1, 2002*, Lect. Notes Phys. **631**, 41 (2003), [,41(2002)], arXiv:gr-qc/0210094 [gr-qc].
[19] M. Bojowald, Living Rev. Rel. **8**, 11 (2005), arXiv:gr-qc/0601085 [gr-qc].
[20] A. Ashtekar and J. Lewandowski, Class. Quant. Grav. **21**, R53 (2004), arXiv:gr-qc/0404018 [gr-qc].
[21] P. Singh and K. Vandersloot, Phys. Rev. **D72**, 084004 (2005), arXiv:gr-qc/0507029 [gr-qc].
[22] A. Ashtekar, M. Bojowald, and J. Lewandowski, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **7**, 233 (2003), arXiv:gr-qc/0304074 [gr-qc].



FIG. 5. 1σ and 2σ confidence regions of *Planck result. The big (small) star indicates N=60(N=50) e-folding. Here we use* $C_\phi = 0.01$*,* $f = 0.85$ *and* $A = 0.35$ *for case* $m = 1$.

[23] A. Ashtekar, T. Pawlowski, and P. Singh, Phys. Rev. **D74**, 084003 (2006), arXiv:gr-qc/0607039 [gr-qc].
[24] A. Ashtekar, T. Pawlowski, and P. Singh, Phys. Rev. **D73**, 124038 (2006), arXiv:gr-qc/0604013 [gr-qc].
[25] H.-H. Xiong and J.-Y. Zhu, Phys. Rev. **D75**, 084023 (2007), arXiv:gr-qc/0702003 [gr-qc].
[26] L.-F. Li and J.-Y. Zhu, Phys. Rev. **D79**, 124011 (2009), arXiv:0812.3552 [gr-qc].
[27] G. W. Gibbons, Phys. Lett. **B537**, 1 (2002), arXiv:hep-th/0204008 [hep-th].
[28] Y.-F. Cai, J. B. Dent, and D. A. Easson, Phys. Rev. **D83**, 101301 (2011), arXiv:1011.4074 [hep-th].
[29] S. del Campo, R. Herrera, and J. Saavedra, Eur. Phys. J. **C59**, 913 (2009), arXiv:0812.1081 [gr-qc].
[30] M. R. Setare and V. Kamali, JHEP **03**, 066 (2013), arXiv:1302.0493 [hep-th].
[31] X.-M. Zhang and J.-Y. Zhu, JCAP **1402**, 005 (2014), arXiv:1311.5327 [gr-qc].
[32] M. R. Setare and V. Kamali, Phys. Rev. **D87**, 083524 (2013), arXiv:1305.0740 [hep-th].
[33] M. R. Setare and V. Kamali, Phys. Lett. **B739**, 68 (2014), arXiv:1408.6516 [physics.gen-ph].
[34] M. R. Setare and V. Kamali, Phys. Lett. **B736**, 86 (2014), arXiv:1407.2604 [gr-qc].
[35] M. Bastero-Gil, A. Berera, R. Cerezo, R. O. Ramos, and G. S. Vicente, JCAP **1211**, 042 (2012), arXiv:1209.0712 [astro-ph.CO].
[36] E. W. Kolb and M. S. Turner, Front. Phys. **69**, 1 (1990).
[37] M. Bastero-Gil, A. Berera, and R. O. Ramos, JCAP **1107**, 030 (2011), arXiv:1106.0701 [astro-ph.CO].
[38] Y. Zhang, JCAP **0903**, 023 (2009), arXiv:0903.0685 [hep-ph].
[39] A. Berera, M. Gleiser, and R. O. Ramos, Phys. Rev. **D58**, 123508 (1998), arXiv:hep-ph/9803394 [hep-ph].
[40] J. Yokoyama and A. D. Linde, Phys. Rev. **D60**, 083509 (1999), arXiv:hep-ph/9809409 [hep-ph].
[41] R. Herrera, M. Olivares, and N. Videla, Phys. Rev. **D88**, 063535 (2013), arXiv:1310.0780 [gr-qc].
[42] G. Panotopoulos and N. Videla, Eur. Phys. J. **C75**, 525 (2015), arXiv:1510.06981 [gr-qc].
[43] A. Berera, I. G. Moss, and R. O. Ramos, Rept. Prog. Phys. **72**, 026901 (2009), arXiv:0808.1855 [hep-ph].
[44] I. G. Moss and C. Xiong, JCAP **0811**, 023 (2008), arXiv:0808.0261 [astro-ph].
[45] M. Bastero-Gil, A. Berera, R. O. Ramos, and J. G. Rosa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 151301 (2016), arXiv:1604.08838 [hep-ph].
[46] I. G. Moss and C. Xiong, (2006), arXiv:hep-ph/0603266 [hep-ph].
[47] J. C. Bueno Sanchez, M. Bastero-Gil, A. Berera, and K. Dimopoulos, Phys. Rev. **D77**, 123527 (2008), arXiv:0802.4354 [hep-ph].
[48] R. O. Ramos and L. A. da Silva, JCAP **1303**, 032 (2013), arXiv:1302.3544 [astro-ph.CO].
[49] R. Cerezo and J. G. Rosa, JHEP **01**, 024 (2013), arXiv:1210.7975 [hep-ph].
[50] J. D. Barrow, Class. Quant. Grav. **13**, 2965 (1996).
[51] J. D. Barrow, A. R. Liddle, and C. Pahud, Phys. Rev. **D74**, 127305 (2006), arXiv:astro-ph/0610807 [astro-ph].
[52] J. D. Barrow and A. R. Liddle, Phys. Rev. **D47**, 5219 (1993), arXiv:astro-ph/9303011 [astro-ph].
[53] M. Bojowald, H. H. Hernandez, M. Kagan, P. Singh, and A. Skirzewski, Phys. Rev. **D74**, 123512 (2006), arXiv:gr-qc/0609057 [gr-qc].
[54] E. Wilson-Ewing, Class. Quant. Grav. **29**, 215013 (2012), arXiv:1205.3370 [gr-qc].
[55] M. Bojowald, G. M. Hossain, M. Kagan, and S. Shankaranarayanan, Phys. Rev. **D78**, 063547 (2008), arXiv:0806.3929 [gr-qc].
[56] T. Cailleteau, J. Mielczarek, A. Barrau, and J. Grain, Class. Quant. Grav. **29**, 095010 (2012), arXiv:1111.3535 [gr-qc].
[57] X. Zhang and Y. Ling, JCAP **0708**, 012 (2007), arXiv:0705.2656 [gr-qc].
[58] A. N. Taylor and A. Berera, Phys. Rev. **D62**, 083517 (2000), arXiv:astro-ph/0006077 [astro-ph].
[59] J. Mielczarek, Phys. Rev. **D83**, 023502 (2011), arXiv:1009.2359 [astro-ph.CO].